



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Executive Office of Environmental Affairs

251 Causeway Street, Suite 900

Boston, MA 02114-2119

MITT ROMNEY
GOVERNOR

KERRY HEALEY
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

ELLEN ROY HERZFELDER
SECRETARY

Tel. (617) 626-1000
Fax (617) 626-1181
<http://www.mass.gov/envir>

June 23, 2003

CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
ON THE
EXPANDED ENVIRONMENTAL NOTIFICATION FORM

PROJECT NAME : Arborway Streetcar Restoration
Project
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY : Boston
PROJECT WATERSHED : Charles River
EOEA NUMBER : 12999
PROJECT PROPONENT : Massachusetts Bay Transportation
Authority (MBTA)
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR : March 25, 2003

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G. L. c. 30, ss. 61-62H) and Section 11.03 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I hereby determine that this project **requires** the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

If well designed and coordinated, this project holds tremendous potential to advance the priority policy goals of smart growth and support for continued investment in mass transit. It represents a significant investment in urban mass transit and fulfills a longstanding commitment made by the Commonwealth to include urban and suburban transit projects as an integral element of the Central Artery/Tunnel Project (CA/T). For this project to achieve its potential, however, the MBTA must continue to coordinate with state and city agencies, local businesses and citizens and other stakeholders to address the unique design challenges that this project presents.

Restoration of light rail to this corridor has been debated for many years and continues to be a controversial issue. I have received over 400 comment letters on this project. I have received a comment letter from Mayor Tom Menino, from members of the Boston City Council, from members of the state Legislature, from multiple city, state and regional agencies, from environmental advocacy groups, from park advocacy groups, from groups that represent bicyclists, from groups that represent the disabled, from neighborhood groups, from hundreds of businesses, and from hundreds of residents. The only clear consensus that has emerged from my review of these comments is that people care passionately about the future of this corridor, want to protect its character and vitality, and consider themselves important stakeholders in this process.

Many commentators have raised a number of concerns and issues that must be addressed to ensure the success of this long-term improvement but many of these issues are not new or particular to the restoration of light rail. To different degrees, congestion, enforcement of traffic rules and regulations, accessibility of the transit system, and bicycle and pedestrian safety have posed challenges during the years that trolleys operated in this corridor, after trolley service was discontinued and continue today.

The width of the corridor and its very vitality present challenges to making this long-term improvement to transit service. The key to its success is the development of a final design that balances, to the maximum extent possible, the many uses the corridor supports. This project offers an opportunity for the MBTA, the City of Boston and its agencies, and the Metropolitan District Commission (MDC) to address some of these longstanding issues while facilitating the restoration of light rail service. The design must be carefully planned and coordinated with the entities noted above as well as the Arborway Rail Restoration Project Advisory Committee (ARRPAC), the business community, public safety officials and many other stakeholders.

Project Description

As described in the Expanded Environmental Notification Form (ENF), the project will restore the Green Line's "E" line service to a 2.2 mile corridor from the existing Heath Street Station to the Forest Hills Station. The corridor consists of three distinct sections of roadway - South Huntington, Centre

Street and South Street - of varying widths (from 42 to 54 feet), varied land uses (commercial, residential, institutional, and open space) and traffic levels (15,000, 17,000 and 12,000 average daily trips respectively). The corridor contains one travel lane in each direction, 8-foot parking lanes, and 8-foot sidewalks. Four bus lines operate along the corridor although the Route 39 (from Forest Hills to Back Bay) will be discontinued when light rail service is restored. The project includes replacement of tracks, ADA compliant stations, an overhead contact system (OCS), and construction of a new power substation. Modifications to the existing drainage system include new catch basins and manholes and changes to existing structures to collect stormwater runoff and prevent ponding. The project cost is estimated at \$58 million (assuming no purchase of new light rail vehicles) to \$95 million (assuming purchase of 13 new light rail vehicles).

The MBTA proposes to provide service using light rail vehicles in a two-car consist (including at least one low-floor vehicle in each consist to comply with provisions of the American Disabilities Act (ADA)). The consists will be 146 feet long with an ability to carry 402 passengers. Trolleys will be stored and maintained at the MBTA Arborway Yard facility (previously reviewed as EOE A #12898). Eight new station locations have been proposed including Forest Hills, Child Street, Monument, JP Center, Beaufort Road, Moraine/Boylston, Perkins Street, Bynner Street, and VA Hospital. The stations will extend from the existing sidewalks across the parking lanes to the track alignment. Stations will be a minimum of 138 feet long and 8 inches high.

The MBTA will continue to coordinate the project design with the Arborway Rail Restoration Project Advisory Committee (ARRPAC), which was formed in May 2002 to represent the community's interests during the planning and construction of the light rail. ARRPAC includes citizens, business owners, community leaders, project planners, and city and state officials.

Jurisdiction and Permits

The project is subject to review and mandatory preparation of an EIR pursuant to Section 11.03 (6)(a)(5) of the MEPA regulations because it may require a state permit and consists of a new rail or rapid transit line along a new, unused or abandoned right-of-way for transportation of passengers or freight. The project may require a curb cut permit from the

Metropolitan District Commission (MDC). Because the proponent is a state agency, MEPA jurisdiction extends to all aspects of the project that may cause significant Damage to the Environment including those issues that relate to air quality/traffic congestion, noise, vibration, stormwater, and construction period impacts.

Single EIR Request

In accordance with Section 11.05 (7) of the MEPA regulations, the proponent has submitted an Expanded ENF with a request that I allow the proponent to fulfill its EIR obligations under MEPA with a Single EIR, rather than the usual process of a Draft and Final EIR. The Expanded ENF received an extended comment period pursuant to Section 11.06 (8) of the MEPA regulations and the MBTA voluntarily extended the comment period until June 13, 2003 to provide opportunities for further review and input.

Transit service along the Arborway portion of the Green Line's "E" line was temporarily halted in 1985 for repairs but never resumed. Restoration of light rail service by the Executive Office of Transportation and Construction (EOTC), through the MBTA, was required as part of the CA/T air quality mitigation commitments that also included other urban (e.g. Washington Street Replacement Service, Blue Line Modernization and Platform Lengthening) and suburban transit projects (commuter rail extensions to Worcester, Newburyport, restoration of the Old Colony). This commitment was codified in the DEP Transit System Improvement Regulations (310 CMR 7.36) in 1991. These regulations permit EOTC/MBTA to provide a substitute project but only if it can demonstrate that *the original project is infeasible* due to adverse engineering, environmental or economic impacts.

The Expanded ENF summarizes the MBTA's exploration of alternatives to light rail restoration and relevant public processes since service was discontinued. Copies of alternatives analyses were submitted to MEPA as Technical Appendices to the Expanded ENF. From 1998 to 2001, the MBTA attempted to demonstrate to DEP that restoration was infeasible and proposed to substitute light rail restoration with improved bus service using Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) vehicles. It is important to note that the replacement projects proposed by the MBTA as part of the substitution process were presented as environmental equivalents, not as projects that would further avoid or minimize damage to the environment. DEP found, in both

instances, that EOTC/MBTA failed to prove infeasibility and directed EOTC/MBTA to complete the project. The MBTA is required by law to restore light rail to this corridor and has been required to do so for over a decade.

Restoration of low emission light rail service is being designed to provide air quality benefits through use of a low-polluting technology and by increasing ridership over existing levels. The MBTA has engaged various stakeholders in a local planning process through the ARRPAC to assist in designing a project that maximizes efficiency of service and environmental benefits while avoiding and minimizing environmental and community impacts. The environmental impacts of this project are consistent with the construction of a transit service in a dense urban corridor (noise, vibration, and construction period impacts), and the project will not alter natural resources, such as wetlands or wildlife habitat, nor will it increase impervious surfaces. The Expanded ENF provides adequate information about baseline conditions, potential impacts of the project and identifies a range of mitigation options that can be employed to address these impacts.

Based on a review of the Expanded ENF and the significant procedural history in support of this alternative, I hereby find that the Expanded ENF meets the regulatory requirements and I am permitting the proponent to file a Single EIR in fulfillment of Section 11.03 of the MEPA regulations. The following Scope is intended to identify additional information, analysis and commitments necessary to address concerns identified during MEPA review.

SCOPE

General

The Single EIR should follow Section 11.07 of the MEPA regulations for outline and content, as modified by this scope. The Single EIR should include a copy of this Certificate. The Single EIR should provide a project schedule, update project costs and identify funding sources. It should include more detailed information on station designs, changes to existing street patterns, modifications to the existing overhead wire system, power substation including designs, renderings, and where appropriate illustrations or photos. The maintenance facility and substation should be added to all corridor figures. It should describe the consistency of this project with previous and ongoing planning efforts including the Arborway Master Plan, the Emerald Necklace Master Plan, the DEM Historic Parkways

Initiative and any relevant transportation plans. The Single EIR should update the list of required federal and state permits and approvals, an update on their status, and an update on local permitting issues.

Alternatives Analysis

I have received numerous comments regarding the need, or lack thereof, for a full alternatives analysis in the EIR. As noted previously, the restoration of light rail in Jamaica Plain remains a part of the Commonwealth's transit commitments developed as part and parcel of the CA/T Project permitting and included in the SIP. DEP has directed the MBTA to restore light rail service and the MBTA is legally required to do so. Therefore, I will not ask the MBTA to explore additional alternatives that are inconsistent with this requirement.

The Single EIR will address how light rail restoration can be designed to maximize benefits over No Build conditions and to minimize impacts while addressing the needs and concerns of the community. The MBTA identified baseline (or No Build) conditions in the Expanded ENF. Additional information on baseline conditions should be provided, in particular, on traffic conditions for a larger study area, and incorporation of existing conditions for walking and cycling.

Air Quality

Eastern Massachusetts remains in serious non-attainment for ozone, whose precursors are nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Ozone pollution causes a variety of health problems including aggravated asthma, reduced lung capacity and increased susceptibility to respiratory illnesses like pneumonia and bronchitis. A recent study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention revealed that Massachusetts has the highest rates of asthma for adults in the nation. Asthma rates in Jamaica Plain are among the highest in the state. Cars, trucks and buses, are the largest source of criteria air pollutants, air toxics and greenhouse gases in the state. Restoration of streetcar service will reduce local air quality impacts by replacing the Route 39 bus (which generates 2,100 bus vehicle miles along the corridor each day) with streetcars powered by electricity and will provide an alternative to driving within this congested corridor.

The air quality benefits associated with this project in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) are a 6.22 kilograms per day

reduction in volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions and a 98.49 kilogram per day reduction in carbon monoxide (CO) emissions. The MBTA must prepare a mesoscale and microscale air quality analysis to update the information on air quality benefits based on the proposed design and operations plan. The mesoscale analysis will examine the broad regional impacts of the project and predict total emission reductions including the impacts of eliminating the Route 39 bus service from Forest Hills to Copley Square. This analysis should identify reductions in VOC, NOx, greenhouse gases and particulate matter (PM). The microscale analysis will examine localized carbon monoxide (CO) conditions and identify development of hot spots related to traffic congestion. The MBTA should consult with DEP regarding the development of the study protocols before initiating the study and submitting the Single EIR.

Many commentors raised a concern that restoration of streetcar service may actually contribute to air pollution by blocking and slowing traffic that could lead to more idling and/or circulation of vehicles as they seek alternate routes and/or parking spaces. The traffic and air quality analysis in the Single EIR will be designed to identify this impact and its effect on air quality.

Transit Ridership

The air quality benefits of light rail restoration will vary depending on the ridership levels that can be generated by the project design and operating plan. The Single EIR should propose a final design and operating plan that generates the highest level of ridership possible while balancing the use of MBTA resources and community impacts. According to the 2001 Arborway Alternatives Analysis Final Report, restoration of light rail service was estimated to generate 18,750 passengers per day on the Forest Hills to Heath Street portion of the service based on headways of 6 minutes during peak hours. The Single EIR shall include updated ridership estimates generated by the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) regional demand model.

The ridership estimates should be developed based on a range of headways and other operating parameters but at least one scenario should include a peak headway of 6 minutes. The Single EIR should describe the assumptions used to generate the ridership numbers (including the margin of error associated with the model) and the operating parameters necessary to achieve them such as number and type of vehicles, consist size, vehicle

capacity, travel time and peak and off peak headways. The Single EIR should include a discussion of impacts and/or benefits associated with achieving various ridership levels.

Analysis of Transit Operations and Traffic

The Boston Transportation Department (BTD), the Boston Parks and Recreation Department (BPRD), MDC, and the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) and many commentators have called for a larger study area for the traffic analysis to understand the effect streetcar restoration will have on local and regional traffic patterns. Recognizing that this service will operate in a dense corridor long beset by congestion and that the re-introduction of streetcar service may affect traffic patterns and circulation, I am requiring the MBTA to work with the BTD, BPRD, MDC and MAPC to broaden the traffic study area to address their concerns.

While I believe the concerns expressed by public agencies, businesses, and residents warrant a broader study area for the traffic analysis, it represents a significant expansion of the MBTA's proposed study area. I want to make it clear that the purpose of expanding the analysis is not to hold the MBTA responsible for mitigating longstanding congestion problems but, rather, to identify the specific impacts of this project and ensure it is designed to avoid, minimize and mitigate them. This information will help the MBTA and the City of Boston assess the consistency of this project with other planning efforts and projects in the area and facilitate exploration of design, infrastructure and operational changes to the corridor and the regional traffic network that could support trolley restoration while improving traffic flow.

The MBTA will use VIISIM or PARAMICS software for evaluating streetcar operations in mixed traffic. This model can provide standard level of service and queue analysis as well as simulate transit vehicle operations, diversion of trips due to traffic congestion, and assess the effectiveness of various mitigation strategies such as a coordinated traffic signal system and/or priority signalization for streetcars and emergency vehicles. This provides a valuable tool to determine what the actual impact of the project is and the extent to which specific mitigation measures can address impacts.

The MBTA should analyze traffic for existing, build and no build conditions to evaluate the implications of the project for intersection Level of Service (LOS). The Single EIR should

include capacity analyses and a summary of average and 95th percentile vehicle queues, and actual delay times, for each intersection in the study area. The analysis should incorporate school zones, bus operations, and school related pick-up/drop-off activity into the existing conditions.

At a minimum, the traffic analysis should include:

- all of the signalized and unsignalized intersections included in the Expanded ENF;
- all unsignalized intersections from the intersection of Huntington and South Huntington to Centre Street, South Street and Forest Hill Station; and,
- all signalized intersections on the section of the Arborway/Jamaica Way that parallels the corridor, the area around Forest Hills T Station south to Walk Hill Street, Washington Street to Columbus Avenue and Columbus Avenue to Heath Street.

The MBTA has indicated that it will present a strategy for mitigating traffic and parking impacts of the project in the Single EIR. The strategy will address parking supply, emergency vehicle access, and anticipated impacts to vehicular flow and congestion, pedestrians, bicycles, and transit services associated with proposed operations and station locations. The MBTA has outlined a broad range of mitigation measures to address impacts of the project that range from comprehensive changes to the design and operation of the corridor (e.g. creation of a pedestrian mall on sections of the corridor, one way circulation on Centre and/or South Street, elimination of parking on one or both sides of Centre and/or South Street) to improving the efficiency of existing operations (traffic signal coordination options, transit system priority, redesign on-street parking and loading to optimize capacity). The MBTA is limited in terms of its ability to implement some of the mitigation (e.g. the MBTA does not own or operate the road, expansion of off street parking may require cooperation of private property owners) but it will be useful to understand all approaches that are available to address issues in this corridor.

The intersections around Forest Hills Station that present challenges to the safe and efficient movement of motorists, cyclists and pedestrians should be a particular focus for mitigation. Coordination with the MDC, BTD and BPRD to improve the intersections, signals, and parkway connections would provide a significant benefit to circulation in the corridor for transportation and recreation. The MBTA should specifically

coordinate the curb cut and access design that emerges from the ongoing discussions with the MDC as part of the Arborway Yard Project (EOEA #12898) and report on revised designs.

The City of Boston, including the Boston Fire Department and the Boston Transportation Department, and many other commentors have expressed concern about the impact of fixed rail trolleys on emergency response times. The Arborway corridor is an important route for emergency vehicles serving Jamaica Plain and surrounding communities and the district's fire station is located on Centre Street. Currently, only one traffic signal (Centre/Thomas) provides a fire pre-emption control. The traffic analysis should include simulation of emergency vehicle operations and model the effects of expanding signal pre-emption for emergency vehicles. The Single EIR should describe practices used in other cities operating street cars in similar conditions to address conflicts with emergency vehicles, review emergency procedures on other surface lines for their applicability in this corridor, and propose emergency protocols that will be incorporated into the operating plan.

The Single EIR should identify proposed changes to the three bus routes that will remain in service when the #39 bus service is retired. The Single EIR should include the bus stop consolidation plan, clarify the impact of station design on buses, and incorporate these assumptions into the transit operation and traffic modeling.

Station Design and Locations

Station design and location is an important factor in the design of the project and will impact ridership, travel times, access, parking availability and congestion. Station design and locations were developed with input from ARRPAC. The "trolley station" design proposed by the MBTA is intended to provide safe and efficient loading and unloading of passengers, to be consistent with ADA and universal design principals, and to improve the street environment. Station locations were based on a number of siting criteria designed to provide a high quality service throughout the corridor while minimizing impacts. Criteria include the following: ¼ mile spacing between stations; even distribution of station stops; avoidance of impacts to emergency and public safety vehicles; proximity to elderly housing, independent living and assisted living complexes; proximity to high ridership bus stops; limiting impacts to existing driveways; accommodating two car trains; and locations near medical institutions.

Review of the Expanded ENF and comments indicate that there is support for the criteria used to develop the station locations and, for the most part, support for the proposed locations. The proposed station locations can be used to develop the initial ridership model and traffic analysis. The streetcar operations and traffic analysis will provide valuable information that can be used to test the assumptions about the locations and how they effect trolley operations and traffic conditions. As this analysis is developed, the MBTA and ARRPAC should carefully consider comments provided on station locations and evaluate whether adjustments are warranted. The Single EIR should propose final station locations and describe how they support the efficiency and effectiveness of restoration while minimizing impacts.

A number of comment letters have highlighted a concern that elimination of the Route 39 bus will impact individuals with disabilities because, while the restoration project will comply with ADA and the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board requirements, existing "E" line stations from Heath to Brigham Circle are not accessible. The Single EIR should indicate how compliance will be achieved for these stations and whether it will be incorporated into the restoration project.

I understand business owners and residents have expressed significant concern about the impact of this project on parking and loading zones throughout the corridor. This section of the Single EIR should describe the impact of the station size and locations on parking supply and loading zones (including areas that will become available through consolidation of existing bus stop locations). The MBTA should work with the BTB and businesses to propose a comprehensive re-design of parking and loading zones that can minimize the impact of the project on parking supply, and identify opportunities for increasing parking supply adjacent to the corridor.

The Single EIR should provide more detailed designs and renderings of the stations, describe amenities that will be provided (canopies, street furniture, lighting, vending machines, trash receptacles, etc.), and any other changes to the existing streetscape. Illustrations of the OCS poles and wirings should be included in this section. The Single EIR should discuss the opportunities and challenges related to combining overhead wire systems and street light fixtures to contribute to a more attractive streetscape. I understand this approach is used in many cities without incident.

Noise/Vibration

Monitoring conducted by the MBTA demonstrates that noise levels within the corridor are consistent with those of dense, urban areas. Much of the noise is a result of traffic, particularly the large number of MBTA and school buses traveling the corridor as well as delivery trucks and passenger vehicles. The corridor includes a number of sensitive receptors such as homes, hospitals and nursing homes where nighttime noise is a particular concern.

The Single EIR shall include a detailed noise assessment for the corridor (including the area around Forest Hills) that is consistent with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines, and an assessment of the impact of restoration of streetcar service on the surrounding community. The Single EIR should indicate areas where mitigation is needed based on the impact assessment and identify the specific mitigation that will be proposed from the list included in the Expanded ENF (use of ballast along the tracks, sound insulation, sound barriers and/or a strict maintenance plan).

Restoration of streetcar service will produce less frequent but higher levels of vibration because the vehicles are heavier than existing buses and their ability to carry significantly more riders than a bus results in fewer trips along the corridor. The Expanded ENF includes a number of mitigation measures the MBTA can employ to mitigate vibration impacts (ballast mats, optimization of wheel and rail profiles in addition to regular wheel truing and rail grinding, low vibration special trackwork and high resilience rail fasteners). The Single EIR should clearly identify where mitigation will be provided based on the detailed need assessment and propose specific mitigation measure.

Drainage/Stormwater

This project is taking place entirely within a developed corridor and will not increase the amount of impervious surfaces. The MBTA should describe the existing infrastructure and management of the stormwater management system and describe any changes to it. The Single EIR should discuss whether the restoration affords any opportunities for improvement the stormwater infrastructure and management system.

Open Space and Historic Resources

The project is located near many open space resources including the Southwest Corridor Park and the Emerald Necklace and numerous historic properties and districts including the Monument Square Historic District and the Sumner Hill Historic District, as well as the Loring-Greenough House, all of which are listed in the State and National Registers of Historic Places. The corridor also contains many properties located in the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets. State and city historic agencies have identified the cultural importance of this corridor and requested that additional information on station designs, street layout and the catenary system be prepared to assist their review of the project.

The Single EIR should update the Historic and Cultural Resource maps to identify any Boston Landmarks on or adjacent to the corridor and to reflect all of the protected open space resources in the area and specifically identify any parks or open spaces with historic standing. The Boston Parks and Recreation Department (BPRD) has noted that Monument Square (Soldier's Monument) is a BPRD property and should be included in this figure. This section of the Single EIR should include a discussion of any air quality, noise, vibration and stormwater impacts to open spaces and cultural resources.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Access

I note that the accommodation of bicycles in the corridor continues to generate significant concern among many commentors, including Better Transit Without Trolleys and the Boston Bicycle Advisory Committee (BBAC). As has been noted, the needs of many users must be balanced within this narrow corridor including transit riders, drivers, walkers and cyclists. The restoration of light rail to this corridor necessitates the continued use of trolley tracks. Cyclists have indicated that trolley tracks can pose a serious hazard and that the side reservations with trolley stations extending into the roadway make it more difficult to navigate around parked cars and other obstacles.

To facilitate the evaluation of impacts to cycling, the Single EIR should update the Existing Conditions section to better characterize bicycle and pedestrian conditions within the corridor from Huntington to Forest Hills. The MBTA should consult with Walk Boston, Mass Bike and the Boston Bicycle Advisory Committee (BBAC) on the development of this

information. The Single EIR should clearly identify all bike routes and multi-use paths within the study area of the traffic analysis.

The Single EIR should identify impacts to cyclists and propose measures that could minimize or mitigate this impact including: use of depressible rail inserts that can fill or reduce gaps in tracks; accommodation of cyclists within trolley stations (e.g. City of Portland, OR); accommodation of bicycles on the light rail vehicles; provision of centralized bike parking within commercial areas; and, public education. The Single EIR should describe any impacts to pedestrians access or safety resulting from the project design.

Construction Period Impacts

The Single EIR should describe construction phasing and construction period impacts including dust, noise and vibration and propose appropriate mitigation. The MBTA indicated in the Expanded ENF that it would address traffic management, parking and access to businesses in developing construction staging plans, including work zones and hours of operation. Mitigation measures may include design of alternative routes, temporary street closures, or temporary one-way traffic patterns, alternative pedestrian and bicycle routes and crossings, and measures to maintain delivery access to businesses. A draft plan should be included in the Single EIR.

The MBTA has developed a construction equipment retrofit program to reduce exposure to diesel exhaust fumes and particulate emissions for its construction projects. The MBTA will require contractors to retrofit construction equipment while working in this dense, urban corridor.

Mitigation

The Single EIR should include a separate chapter on mitigation measures. This chapter should include proposed Section 61 Findings (in the form of a draft Letter of Commitment) for all state permits. It should provide a clear commitment to implement these measures, include a schedule for implementation, and identify the parties responsible for implementation.

Comments and Circulation

The Single EIR should include a copy of each comment received. The EIR need not reproduce every form letter, but should include one "template" from each form letter. The EIR should respond to the substantive comments received including the substantive issues raised in form letters and/or petitions. The proponent should circulate a hard copy of the EIR to each state and city agency from which the proponent will seek permits or approvals and to each of the City agencies that submitted comments. The proponent should also circulate a copy of the EIR to those submitting individual written comments. To save paper and other resources, the proponent may circulate the EIR in CD-ROM format, although the proponent should make available a reasonable number of hard copies, to accommodate those without convenient access to a computer to be distributed upon request on a first come, first served basis. In addition, a copy of the Single EIR should be made available for public review at the Jamaica Plain branch of the Boston Public Library. The proponent should send a notice of availability of the EIR (including relevant comment deadlines and appropriate addresses) to those who submitted form letter and for which addresses are available. This notification may be made electronically.

June 23, 2003

Date


Ellen Roy Herzfelder

Comment list attached

ERH/CDB/cdb

Comments received:

04/30/03 Transcript of April 30, 2003 MBTA public hearing
04/30/03 Transcript of second court reporter at April 30, 2002 MBTA hearing
06/04/03 Transcript of June 4, 2003 MBTA public hearing
06/04/03 Transcript of second court reporter at June 4, 03 MBTA hearing
06/18/03 Metropolitan District Commission
06/02/03 Department of Environmental Protection
05/12/03 Massachusetts Historical Commission
05/15/03 Senator Dianne Wilkerson
05/09/03 Mayor Thomas M. Menino, City of Boston
05/06/03 Michael P. Ross, Boston City Council
06/04/03 Chuck Turner, Boston City Council
06/04/03 Boston Fire Department
06/13/03 Boston Transportation Department
06/13/03 Boston Parks Department
05/12/03 Boston Landmarks Commission
05/06/03 Boston Water and Sewer Commission
05/01/03 Boston Bicycle Advisory Committee
06/13/02 Metropolitan Area Planning Council
06/13/03 Arthur L. Johnson, Harvard Legal Services Center on behalf of Better Transit Without Trolleys
06/13/03 Petition signed by 116 business owners submitted by Better Transit Without Trolleys
05/12/03 The Arborway Committee (letter and petition signed by 260 individuals)
06/10/03 The Arborway Committee (second letter)
05/02/03 Jamaica Plain Business and Professional Association
06/04/03 Asticou-Martinwood-South Street Neighborhood Association
04/30/03 Petition signed by 1,648 people submitted by Marie O'Shea in two letters
06/04/03 Petition signed by 377 individuals submitted by Barbara Nunez
06/11/03 Access Advisory Committee to the MBTA
05/12/03 Adaptive Environments
06/12/03 Disability Law Center
06/13/03 Boston Center for Independent Living
05/12/03 Conservation Law Foundation
05/11/03 MASSPIRG
05/08/03 Central Artery Environmental Oversight Committee
06/12/03 The Emerald Necklace Conservancy
05/09/03 Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay, Inc.
06/09/03 D. Abrams
04/30/03 Dorothy and Benton Abrams
05/09/03 Dorothy Abrams (second letter)

05/09/03 Benton D. Abrams (second letter)
05/09/03 Lyn Ackerly
05/11/03 Eve Belfer-Ahern
05/09/03 Cheikh Ahmed
04/30/03 Kim Alleyne (three letters)
05/09/03 Robert Amelio
05/01/03 Chris Anderson
04/25/03 Matthew R. Andrews
05/09/03 Emily Anesta
05/09/03 Rick Anderson
05/09/03 Leo Antonowitz
05/09/03 Shoham Arad
05/09/03 Bill Archambeault
05/09/03 Andrea Arena
05/09/03 Marc H. Arenault
05/09/03 Steve Atkins
05/09/03 Ricardo Austrich
05/09/03 Alberto Baez
05/09/03 Sarah Bailin
05/28/03 Sarah Bailin (second letter)
06/13/03 Cynthia Bainton
05/09/03 Holly Baker
05/06/03 Martine Baker
04/26/03 Jon Ball
05/05/03 N.J. Barletta
05/09/03 Elizabeth Barry
05/09/03 Mary Barry
05/09/03 Kersten Benderay
05/19/03 Susan Berliner
04/30/03 Daryl Bichel
06/04/03 Daryl Bichel (second letter)
04/26/03 Christopher L. Blackler
05/03/03 Kevin Block-Schwenk
05/10/03 Robert D. Blum
06/05/03 Linda Booth
05/09/03 Richard T. Born
05/09/03 Azzeddine Bouteouie
06/11/03 Patricia Boylan
05/09/03 Winston Braman
05/04/03 Betsey Brooks
05/03/03 Cynthia Quentin Brown
06/13/03 Mira Brown
05/06/03 Susan Hardy Brown
06/11/03 Kevin Buckley
05/09/03 JoAnne Buckmire
06/14/03 Andrew Calafut
04/30/03 John Callahan
06/04/03 Thomas Cameron

05/09/03 John Campbell
06/11/03 Michael Campia
04/30/03 Thomas Carvey
06/04/03 Manuel R. Castellanos and Paul J. Leahy
05/05/03 Matthew P. Caswell
04/30/03 William Chapman
05/09/03 Elizabeth Charney
06/10/03 Paul Lee & Linda Chu
04/30/03 John Cipolla
05/09/03 Howard Ckatz
05/09/03 Shannon Cleary
04/30/03 Patricia Clifford
05/03/03 Krystyna Colburn
06/01/03 Alice Conley
05/10/03 Kevin Coughlin
05/09/03 Peter Coulombe
04/30/03 Thomas Covey
05/09/03 Brian Crabtree
04/30/03 Lawrence Cronin
06/06/03 Emily Curran and John Callahan
06/13/03 Emily Curran (second letter)
05/09/03 Thomas Cummings
05/09/03 Matthew Curson
05/06/03 Cynthia Curtner
05/09/03 Frank D'Costanzo
05/03 Patricia A. Daley
05/09/03 Thomas Davey
05/12/03 Mrs. D.E. Daykin
05/12/03 Neil Daykin
05/02/03 Dan de Angeli (four letters)
05/03 Robert P. De Franceo
06/08/03 Renee DeKona
06/11/03 John Demeter
04/30/03 Kosta Demos
04/30/03 Irene Desharnais
06/10/03 Irene Desharnais (second letter)
06/16/03 Saskia de Vries
05/09/03 Gene DiBenedetto
05/09/03 Chris Dietlin
05/09/03 Deborah Dines
05/09/03 David Doyle
05/09/03 Rachel Dow
05/09/03 Richard Dropski
05/09/03 Mary Durant
05/06/03 Allan M. Dutton
05/09/03 David Edelson
05/09/03 Maureen Eldredge
04/30/03 David W. Elliott

06/15/03 Len Eskowitz
05/09/03 Dan Eshet
05/09/03 Will Fairbrother
05/21/03 Joe Fallon
04/30/03 David Fargen
05/09/03 Luciano Farnet
06/13/03 Harlan Feinsteins
05/09/03 Ramon Fernandes
05/09/03 Robert Fettia
05/09/03 Jennifer Fine
06/01/03 JoAnn Fitzpatrick
05/02/03 Joan A. Foley
05/09/03 Stephen Fowler
06/04/03 Mary Flathey
04/29/03 John Flynn
05/09/03 Mitre Fogelberg
05/09/03 Charles & Elaine Foley
06/04/03 Michael Frank
04/30/03 Sarah E. Freeman
05/08/03 Elizabeth Galloway
06/04/03 Mark Gately
05/09/03 Karen Gauseh
05/09/03 Brooke H. Gillespie
04/26/03 Sarah Glatt
05/09/03 David Goodricci
05/09/03 Marilyn Goodrich
05/11/03 Robert S. Gordberg
05/09/03 Alison Goulder
04/26/03 Tolle Graham
05/09/03 Michele Granda
05/06/03 Frances Gratz
05/07/03 Bernard Gredler
05/09/03 Marta Gredler
04/26/03 Arik Grier
05/09/03 Toni Gustus
05/09/03 Daniel Hall
05/09/03 Theresa Hall
05/09/03 Maya Hanelin
06/11/03 Mary Hannon
05/09/03 Brian Harkins
05/09/03 Edythe Harkins
06/11/03 Ruth Harrington
05/08/03 Aaron Hatinen
05/02/03 Elizabeth Hendricks
04/26/03 Lloyd Hicks
05/09/03 Junette Henry
05/12/03 Matt & Jamie Henzy
05/09/03 Michal Hershon

04/27/03 Linda Hillyer
05/13/03 Regina Hoel
05/03/03 Abby Hoffman
05/28/03 Suzanne M. Hoffman
05/09/03 Andy Hollwell
04/30/03 Peggy Hopper
04/30/03 Jennifer Hodsdon
06/13/03 Greg Howard
05/08/03 Claire E. Humphrey
05/06/03 Jane Hudson
05/09/03 Margaret Lys Hunt
05/06/03 Linda Iglehart
05/09/03 Thomas Iglehart
04/30/03 Allan Ihrer
05/11/03 Allen Ihrer
no date Carolyn Ingles
04/26/03 Denise Jackson
05/09/03 Arthur Jacobson
05/09/03 Richard Jarren
05/08/03 Clark Johnsen
05/09/03 Dorothy Johnson
05/09/03 Jonathan Johnson
05/09/03 Tobias Johnson
06/11/03 Bill Jones
05/09/03 Michael Jones
06/16/03 Julie Joy
05/09/03 Minai Kahn
05/03/03 Brittany Kammerer
05/09/03 Dorothy Keininger
05/27/03 Carol Kemp
06/09/03 Corinne Kennedy
05/11/03 Michael Kennedy
05/12/03 Thomas F. Kennelly
05/13/03 Thomas F. Kennelly
05/09/03 Elizabeth Kenney
05/01/03 Thomas R. Kiley
04/30/03 Jim Kilgore
05/09/03 Julie Kim
05/09/03 Gordon King
05/09/03 John King
05/09/03 Paul King
04/30/03 Karen Kirchoff
05/03 Michael Kirkpatrick
05/09/03 David Knight
05/09/03 Laura Knight
05/09/03 Linda Koretz
05/09/03 Steven Koretz
05/09/03 Adrienne Korman

06/04/03 Ed Kountz
05/03/03 Christine Kraemer
06/04/03 John Kreismanis
05/09/03 Heidi Krueger
05/09/03 Kim Kudrna
05/12/03 Rebecca Kushner
04/30/03 John Kyper
06/04/03 John Kyper (second letter)
05/09/03 Siana LaForest
05/12/03 Timothy J. LaVallée
05/09/03 M Barton Laws
05/09/03 Eileen Leary
05/09/03 Ronald LeBlanc
05/09/03 Lauren Lee
06/04/03 Maxwell Lee
05/09/03 Jean-Pierre LeGuillou
06/12/03 Jean-Pierre LeGuillou (second letter)
05/09/03 Marty Leonard
05/09/03 Awanda Linn
04/30/03 Joanie Lindstrom
06/03/03 Joanie Lindstrom (second letter)
06/09/03 Joanie Lindstrom (third letter)
05/12/03 Ellen J. Lipsey
04/29/03 Reverend Bill Loesch
04/30/03 Susan Mack
05/09/03 Susan Mack (second letter)
06/04/03 Susan Mack (third letter)
05/09/03 John Mackinnon
05/09/03 Mark J. MacMillan
06/09/03 Thomas Mahan
05/10/03 Maureen Maher
05/09/03 Photios Makris
05/09/03 Robert Maloney
05/09/03 Jafar Manselle
05/09/03 Trevor Manselle
05/02/03 Carolyn Manson
05/05/03 John Manson
05/09/03 JoAnne Martel
05/09/03 Greg N. Massaro
05/08/03 Timothy Maxwell
05/09/03 Josephine E. McCall
06/04/03 Mary McCarthy
05/03 Lawrence J & Wendy F. McCarthy
05/09/03 Carly McFee
no date Jean McIntyre
05/09/03 Anne L. McKinnon
05/09/03 Theresa McSweeney
05/03/03 Jeremy Melanson

05/03/03 Laura Melnik
05/09/03 William Merrill
04/30/03 Douglas Mink
05/09/03 Marie Miranda
05/09/03 Shalourae Mitchell
05/09/03 William S. Mitchell
04/30/03 Peg & Kevin Moloney
05/09/03 Michael C. Monk
04/30/03 Susan Montgomery
05/2/03 Anthony R. Moore
05/29/03 Anthony R. Moore (second letter)
04/30/03 Jane Moore
05/09/03 Geoffrey Morgan
05/09/03 Norma Moroney
05/09/03 Michael Moynihan
05/05/03 Pam Mullins
05/09/03 Therese Mucci
05/09/03 Amy Murrett
05/09/03 David Nagle
05/12/03 Srdjan S. Nedeljković
06/15/03 Bob Neer
04/29/03 Dawn Nelson
05/09/03 Dawn Nelson (second letter)
05/09/03 Jeremy Nelson
05/09/03 Chad Neptune
05/09/03 Bien Nguyen
05/16/03 Nancy Merz Nordstrom
04/26/03 Paul Normandia
05/03/03 Terrence O'Brien
05/09/03 Fiona O'Connor & Jorge Davalos
05/09/03 Edward O'Dwyer
04/30/03 Joan O'Hara
04/30/03 Francine Price
05/09/03 Lauren Parker
05/13/03 Ms. Bruce Parkhurst
05/09/03 Katja Paumels
04/25/03 Gabriell DeBear Paye
04/26/03 Josephine Pina
05/09/03 Ann Philips
06/11/03 Daniela Poles
05/09/03 Yolanda Pornanres
05/09/03 Andrew Porter
05/09/03 Herbert Pratt
04/26/03 Virginia Pratt
04/30/03 Virginia Pratt (second letter)
05/09/03 Arthur Prescott
05/09/03 Theresa M. Prescott
05/05/03 Anne M. Puleo

05/09/03 Helen Raizen
05/10/03 Helen Raizen (second letter)
04/30/03 Charles J. Reilly
06/04/03 Noreen Reynolds
05/09/03 Michael Rivera
06/04/03 Maria Rivers
05/06/03 Patricia Roberts
04/20/03 David Rohrlich
05/09/03 Andrew Rozzi
05/08/03 Gail Rush
no date Peg Ryan
05/09/03 Milad Saleh
05/09/03 Felicia Sanchez
05/12/03 Paul Schimek
05/06/03 Kerri Schmidt
05/06/03 Howard and Rivka Schnairsohn
05/06/03 Grace Sciuto
05/05/03 Chester Shea
05/09/03 Christopher Sheppard
05/09/03 David Siegared
05/05/03 Joy Silverstein
04/30/03 Frank Charles Simmons
06/13/03 Diane Simpson
05/27/03 Mark Simpson
05/09/03 Ann Sinclair
no date Joel Sindelar
05/09/03 Holly Sklar
05/09/03 Florence Slepian
05/09/03 Laura Slepian
04/30/03 Brittain Smith
05/08/03 Karl T. Smith
05/09/03 Frances Smolinsky
04/30/03 Mary Smoyer
05/09/03 David Steingesser
05/09/03 Deborah Steingesser
05/09/03 Donna Stiglmeier
05/09/03 Bluma Stoller
05/21/03 Roberta Stone
05/09/03 Mark A. Sullivan
05/09/03 Deborah Sunderman
06/16/03 Gail Sullivan, Frederick Vetterlein, Nanette Skiba,
Joyce Perkit, James P. Camberlain, Oliver Bouchier,
and Curtis Woodlock
04/30/03 S. Swartz
04/30/03 Luis Tamayo
05/09/03 Kathy Tassiopoulos and Guillermo Rivera-Pagan
05/08/03 Deborah Taylor
05/09/03 George Tellier

04/30/03 C. Thompson
04/26/03 Lauren M. Thompson
04/30/03 K. Tilton
05/09/03 Kenneth Tilton
05/09/03 Nancy Tisei
05/03 S. Nichole Tongg
05/09/03 William Trodden
04/30/03 Marie A. Tuiley
04/25/03 Nancy Vakalis
06/09/03 Nancy Vakalis (second letter)
06/10/03 JoAnn Varney
05/09/03 Jennifer Vickery
05/07/03 Ines Vitug
04/26/03 Donovan Walker
05/09/03 AnnMarie Walsh
05/08/03 Mary M. Ward
05/08/03 Michele Waters
06/14/03 David Wean
05/09/03 Stephen Weathers
no date Evie Weinstein
05/09/03 Terrence Wells
05/09/03 Karen Wepsic
06/10/03 Karen Wepsic (second letter)
05/01/03 Sara E. Wermiel
05/09/03 Sara E. Wermiel (second letter)
06/11/03 John Francis West
04/26/03 Kimberly Wetel
04/30/03 David A. White
05/09/03 Frances G. White
05/09/03 Paul White
05/09/03 Richard Wiley
05/03/03 Latoya Williams
04/30/03 Margaret Willison
06/11/03 Ted Williams
05/09/03 Julie A. Wilson
04/30/03 Margaret H. Wilson
05/09/03 Douglas Witte
05/09/03 Sigal Yawetz
05/09/03 Jim Young
06/13/03 Janice Zazinski
05/09/03 Salvatore Zirilli
05/09/03 Frank Zontini
04/30/03 George P. Zoulalian